

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

January 11, 2006

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Snodgrass, Commissioners Hinman, Parnell, Petitpas, Query

**STAFF PRESENT:** Rob Odle, Lori Peckol, Kim Dietz, Terry Shirk - Planning Department;  
Joel Pfundt – Public Works Department

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Karen Nolz

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Snodgrass in the City of Redmond Council Chambers. Commissioner McCarthy was excused. For Items from the Audience, Chair Snodgrass recused himself because he owns property in the North Redmond Neighborhood. Vice Chair Query presided over that portion of the meeting

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved by acclamation.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

The November 9, 2005 Meeting Summary was approved by acclamation.

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

Sterling Leibenguth, 11406 167<sup>th</sup> Place NE, Redmond, WA 98052, spoke about the North Redmond Neighborhood Plan and specifically The Square. He went through a year's notes from the Citizens Advisory Committee meetings, open houses, Planning Commission meetings, and other meetings. He summarized the message from all these notes as being completely unfavorable toward The Square, and recommended that the Planning Commission take this into consideration. He noted other areas in Redmond that do not have retail facilities—Idylwood Park, Grass Lawn Park, Westside Park, and Arthur Johnson Park. He stated that this area is not isolated from retail—only one or two miles away—and does not need a large footprint retail center.

Reed Probst, 11410 165<sup>th</sup> Court NE, Redmond, requested that the Planning Commissioners continue to listen to the neighbors. He suggested that the City leverage its resources and talk to some of the business owners in Redmond to see how they feel about more retail business going into Redmond, with the resulting financial impacts on their businesses. He recommended that the City create two-way communication. The neighbors feel they are providing input but are not getting information in return that would help them validate or invalidate what is happening. He noted that the Equestrian Tracts homeowners would like to avoid the resulting impacts of a retail center—noise, parking, lights, decreasing demand, and decreasing property values.

Joanne Armos Bily, 11512 169<sup>th</sup> Court NE, Redmond, talked about her objections to the proposed fire station meeting space and the retail space. She addressed Mr. Savage's comments about a lack of meeting space in the area, noting there are two public schools with meeting spaces one half mile away and also a park on 172<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE off of NE 116<sup>th</sup> Street. She commented that walking is dangerous on

NE 116<sup>th</sup> Street west of 172<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE from Kensington to Starbucks, and she would like to see tax dollars and time spent on sidewalks instead of waiting for the development.

Suzann Wilson, 11515 167<sup>th</sup> Place NE, Redmond, spoke about the speed of the traffic. She thanked the City for putting the concrete wall on the south side of the culvert replacement area because this has reduced noise. She reported that even though the road was raised about three feet the cars still come from the west at over 35 mph, making it hard to safely pull out in the traffic. She advocated that the speed for the whole length of NE 116<sup>th</sup> Street be lowered to 30 mph. She also would like to encourage the installation of a permanent radar sign in that dip area to alert drivers of their speeds.

Janice Korsmo, 17006 NE 124<sup>th</sup> Street, Redmond, who lives in Sunrise Ridge, talked about the punch-through on 172<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, commenting that she has heard that the City has no plans to develop from NE 124<sup>th</sup> Street out to NE 128<sup>th</sup> Street, which she would like to be changed. She commented that the neighbors do not want The Square. She would also like to see something done to make the intersection by Redmond Junior High School and St. Jude less dangerous.

Murray Gooth, 11508 167<sup>th</sup> Place NE, Redmond, who lives in the Equestrian Tracts, said the neighbors feel there is no feedback from the City and do not want to feel that this is just a process that they have to go through. They need to have responses. They do not think The Square has merit.

Tom Staggs, 17025 NE 112<sup>th</sup> Street, Redmond, in Grayson, said he helped coordinate the survey of the local community to determine support for the activities being proposed by the Citizens Advisory Committee. He talked about the process. He is concerned when he sees tens and hundreds of people coming out in opposition, yet are told by the Planning staff that their opinions do not matter. The Citizens Advisory Committee and other groups are trying to look forward fifteen years, and he hopes the existing people's opinions will be weighed just as strongly as the needs of the future people.

Mary Francis Klug, 11217 165<sup>th</sup> Court NE, Redmond, commented on The Square plan, disagreeing with the area they call the gathering place, and suggesting a well planned park with a play area and a natural area as a public gathering place and focal point.

Vice Chair Query commented on the concern about the process, saying this is a methodical process that considers areas of concern or lacks of understanding. She encouraged them to continue to participate and attend the study sessions to hear the dialogue. The Planning Commission has received quite a few emails, and staff has had an interactive dialogue with some citizens. She explained that the whole North Redmond Neighborhood Plan is under discussion and review.

Commissioner Snodgrass returned to the meeting following Items from the Audience, and resumed his role as chair.

## **PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION**

### **Designation of Portion of Overlake as an Urban Center**

Chair Snodgrass opened the public hearing and study session on designation of a portion of Overlake as an Urban Center, and asked staff to provide an overview of the recommended amendment.

Lori Peckol, Principal Planner, presented the staff report. She explained that this resumes a discussion that the Planning Commission began and almost concluded in October 2003. She described the types of center designations used in the region, their significance, and the regional criteria for urban centers. She also summarized the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to change the type and extent of center designation for Overlake. In response to the City of Bellevue's input in October 2003, staff is proposing a smaller boundary for the Urban Center. Ms. Peckol highlighted what the proposed action would not do,

and went over the rationale for the amendment recommended by staff. She provided an overview of communications between Bellevue and Redmond since October 2003 regarding the proposed urban center designation.

Staff is seeking completion of this amendment by the Planning Commission by the end of January. City Council is scheduled to review and take action in February. Regional processes will begin in April with the King County Growth Management Planning Council.

Joel Pfundt, Principal Planner, City of Redmond Public Works Department, gave an overview of the Overlake Urban Center Residential Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by the Transpo Group, and explained the relationship between this and the Bellevue-Redmond Overlake Transportation Study (BROTS). There is an agreement between Bellevue and Redmond that sets a cap for commercial development in the Bel-Red and Overlake Neighborhoods on how much growth can happen in each of those areas. There is a set of transportation projects that support that level of growth. The City of Redmond has committed to build a certain number of transportation projects, and Bellevue and Redmond are both committing a certain amount of dollars to those projects that will support this amount of commercial development in Overlake and in Bellevue.

He went over the findings of the Residential Traffic Impact Analysis which show that the traffic associated with potential future residential development on properties within the proposed Overlake Urban Center has a fairly localized impact and does not result in the Overlake Transportation Management District exceeding its concurrency standard. The conclusions are that the largest traffic impacts are those directly in the vicinity of the “project” area. The project impacts further from the site are relatively minor because of the distribution of trips and the relatively short trip lengths due to all the employment and services nearby, and in some corridors the largest impact is in the off-peak direction.

Staff’s overall conclusion is that this is an efficient location for additional residential development because of nearby employment and services and because mass transit is readily available and easy to grow. The City of Redmond and City of Bellevue use different concurrency models, and our analysis could not tell the City of Bellevue the level of service impacts on Bellevue’s intersections. He confirmed that there would be more possibilities for Transit Oriented Developments in addition to the existing Village at Overlake.

Ms. Peckol commented that the City of Redmond would hope to see more residential and mixed use redevelopment and infill developments well in advance of Sound Transit Phase 2 actually being constructed.

Commissioner Parnell commented that the area is only surrounded by residential on two sides, the north and south; but on the west side there is Overlake Center Commercial Development. He wanted to know if the City of Bellevue might try to increase housing density at the south and east sides of Overlake.

Rob Odle, Policy Planning Manager, responded that zoning on the south and east side is for single-family residences, and he would not expect to see any changes in the foreseeable future. Future residential development in Overlake would occur whether Overlake is called Urban Center or not; but with that Urban Center designation the City may qualify for more regional support to bring in more mass transit improvements to the area. Once Sound Transit makes a determination and identifies an alignment of where its next phase is going to go, that gives a clear signal to the development community. As soon as Sound Transit gives some strong determinations, people will likely look at where neighboring properties are available and start building in anticipation, if for no other reason than the property will be cheaper to develop at that point than when the line is in place.

Ms. Peckol explained that there are benefits to the City of Bellevue, such as transportation funding, helping with traffic, and support for High-Capacity Transit, if Overlake is designated an urban center.

There was discussion on the proposed amendment and two additional framework policies.

On page 7, Commissioner Parnell wanted to strengthen PR-4, in response to the lack of parks in Overlake.

Ms. Peckol noted that policy PR-4 is not included as part of the proposed amendment. She also reported that the Parks Department has committed to taking a close look at this in the next Park Plan Update. The Planning Commission will see portions of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan this year.

Mr. Parnell thought it would be good to have a park adjoined to the Transportation Oriented Development. He wanted to know a way to encourage public access to private parks. He mentioned that Microsoft is planning to pave over its ball fields, and this will decrease the availability of recreational space in the middle of Overlake.

No members of the public attended the public hearing to testify on the topic. Ms. Peckol summarized and noted that the Planning Commission had copies of written comments from Bertha Eades and from the City of Bellevue. She noted that the City of Bellevue had asked the Planning Commission to keep the public comment period open through the Commission's next discussion on January 18, and that Bellevue expected to provide additional comments at that point.

Chair Snodgrass declared this portion of the public hearing closed at 8:20 p.m., but left the record open until the next meeting.

Ms. Peckol confirmed for Chair Snodgrass that review of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan would include reconsidering the cap on commercial square footage.

Mr. Odle reported that he expressed to the Bellevue Council on Monday evening that the City of Redmond is perplexed with the proposal to undertake conversations regarding designation of Overlake as an urban center at the Council subcommittee or Council level since conversations need to begin at the administrative level, and there have been none on that level. Redmond hopes the Bellevue City Council chooses to take no action regarding Redmond's proposed amendment. This is a local land use matter. A vision has been in place since 1999, and Redmond's proposed amendment ratifies that vision.

Chair Snodgrass asked that the Planning Commission members come prepared to discuss and make a decision on this at the next meeting. Staff will plan to come back with a transmittal report to Council at the meeting following that decision-making meeting.

**\*BREAK\***

## **STUDY SESSION**

### **North Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update**

Commissioner Petitpas chaired this study session. Kim Dietz and Terry Shirk, Senior Planners, responded to Commissioner questions.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the following Issues in the current Issues Matrix with the following determinations:

Issue #3: Storm detention vaults are proposed for dual purposes such as sport courts and off-season garden areas: *Accept the new wording proposed by staff. Closed*

- Issue #4: Inclusion of an extension of 183<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE from south of the Redmond/Puget Power trail, north to NE 116<sup>th</sup> Street: *Closed, but needs some rewording*
- Issue #5: Private streets are discouraged in the North Redmond neighborhood: *Closed pending rewording that would incorporate the environmental issues and a little stronger discouragement of private streets that staff's proposal.*
- Issue #6: Minimum width design for local streets within the neighborhood: *Accept the new wording that staff has proposed..Closed*
- Issue #8: Promoting clustered developments with respect to a neighborhood meeting: *Accept the new wording that staff has proposed. Closed. In the future, staff should prepare a citywide amendment for all Type II Development Permit regarding proposed developments and neighborhood meetings.*
- Issue #13: Native Vegetation and Soil Conservation: *Closed, but add additional language. Try to keep the native soil in North Redmond—prefer the native soils but otherwise high quality soils. Addition of NR-18.5*
- Issue #14: Scenic View: *Closed - acceptable as is.*

Regarding The Square, staff's proposed next steps include hosting an outreach effort to work with the residents and/or representatives of developments that are in the vicinity of the proposed location. Although the Citizens Advisory Committee discussed The Square in length, staff still wants to do this. Staff is hearing from some people that the size is too big, that the proposed types of businesses would not be appropriate, so staff wants to explore: what the residents would like within the development of The Square, what amenities would be preferred, the proposed size limitation, design standards for the structures, the types and scales of businesses, and other features or limitations. For these discussions, staff would like to offer two or three meetings in February. Staff would like to return to the Planning Commission at the end of February with the results of these meetings. Staff's goal is to hold meetings within the neighborhood, such as at Einstein Elementary or otherwise at City Hall.

Commissioner Parnell pointed out that noticeably missing from the list of discussion topics were parking, automobile access, and transit.

Ms. Dietz noted that staff would especially like to have feedback from Sterling Leibenguth, Andy Rathman, Tom Staggs and Reed Probst. Staff will also use its contacts list for inviting residents to the meetings.

Commissioner Hinman commented that some people may support one of the three components: the meeting place, the commercial/retail, or the residential. He recommended identifying the area of most concern.

Staff would examine each one of these three components.

Commissioner Petitpas suggested answering the question—Why did we think Neighborhood Commercial was good for Redmond, and why has it worked in other areas? She also noted the need to discuss the goal and to clarify policies.

Ms. Peckol responded that the Planning Commission has already been fairly detailed conversations about these same issues, and decided to support all three proposed components of The Square (small scale retail, housing, and gathering space).

Commissioner Parnell encouraged some creative thinking from the neighborhood, and suggested that the City could encourage a certain type of business and provide the incentives for affordability to those businesses.

Vice Chair Query supported this idea because she thought at some point this could be made not commercially viable with too much restriction. She pointed out that this location might not be viable for any commercial options due to factors such as being a difficult location for deliveries and others. Ms. Dietz explained that the retail component would be meant to pay for the amenities. The safety measure would be preserved by the presence of someone being there at all times during business hours.

On January 18, the North Redmond study session will be on the proposed rezone of certain properties from R-1 to R-4. At the last meeting in February, staff will return with rewrites after all issues have been covered.

## **ADJOURN**

Chair Snodgrass adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Recording Secretary:

---